arXiv:1411.3334v4 [quant-ph] 15 Sep 2016

Sparse Quantum Codes from Quantum Circuits

Dave Bacon,[1] Steven T. Flammia,[2] Aram W. Harrow,[3] and Jonathan Shi[4]

[1] *Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195 USA*[*]

[2] *Centre for Engineered Quantum Systems, School of Physics, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia*

[3] *Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA*

[4] *Department of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA*

(Dated: September 16, 2016)

We describe a general method for turning quantum circuits into sparse quantum subsystem codes. The idea is to turn each circuit element into a set of low-weight gauge generators that enforce the input-output relations of that circuit element. Using this prescription, we can map an arbitrary stabilizer code into a new subsystem code with the same distance and number of encoded qubits but where all the generators have constant weight, at the cost of adding some ancilla qubits. With an additional overhead of ancilla qubits, the new code can also be made spatially local.

Applying our construction to certain concatenated stabilizer codes yields families of subsystem codes with constant-weight generators and with minimum distance $d = n^{1-\epsilon}$, where $\epsilon = O(1/\sqrt{\log n})$. For spatially local codes in D dimensions we nearly saturate a bound due to Bravyi and Terhal and achieve $d = n^{1-\epsilon-1/D}$. Previously the best code distance achievable with constant-weight generators in any dimension, due to Freedman, Meyer and Luo, was $O(\sqrt{n \log n})$ for a stabilizer code.

I. INTRODUCTION

Sparse quantum error-correcting codes obey the simple constraint that only a constant number of qubits need to be measured at a time to extract syndrome bits. Considerable effort has been devoted to studying sparse quantum codes, most notably in the context of topological quantum error correction [1]. This effort is driven by the fact that the sparsity constraint is quite natural physically, and existing fault-tolerant thresholds [2] and overheads [3] are optimized when the underlying code is sparse. Despite this effort, finding families of *good* sparse quantum codes – i.e. codes with asymptotically constant rate and relative distance – remains an open problem, in stark contrast to the situation for classical codes (see e.g. [4]).

Quantum subsystem codes [5] form a broad generalization of standard stabilizer codes where a subset of logical qubits is sacrificed to allow for extra gauge degrees of freedom. The two principle advantages of subsystem codes are that the measurements needed to extract syndrome information are in general sparser and the errors only need to be corrected modulo gauge freedom, which often improves fault-tolerance thresholds [6].

In this paper, we consider a general recipe that constructs a sparse quantum subsystem code for every Clifford quantum circuit. The new code resembles the circuit in that the layout of the circuit is replaced with new qubits in place of the inputs and outputs of each of the circuit elements. The gauge generators are localized to the region around the erstwhile circuit elements, and thus the sparsity s of the new code is constant when the circuit is composed of few-qubit gates.

When the circuit is a special form of a fault-tolerant syndrome measurement circuit for a "base" quantum stabilizer code encoding k qubits with distance d, then the new sparse subsystem code *inherits* the k and d parameters of the base code. We construct general fault-tolerant circuits of

[*] Current affiliation: Google Inc., Mountain View, CA, USA

the requisite special form, and from this we show how *every* stabilizer code can be mapped into a sparse subsystem code with the same k and d as the original base code.

The number of physical qubits n required for the new code is roughly the circuit size, and this can be chosen to be proportional to the sum of the weights of the original stabilizer generators, when permitting circuit elements to be spatially non-local. This result is summarized in our main theorem.

Theorem 1. *Given any $[n_0, k_0, d_0]$ quantum stabilizer code with stabilizer generators of weight $w_1, \ldots, w_{n_0-k_0}$, there is an associated $[n, k, d]$ quantum subsystem code whose gauge generators have weight $O(1)$ and where $k = k_0$, $d = d_0$, and $n = O(n_0 + \sum_i w_i)$. This mapping is constructive given the stabilizer generators of the base code.*

The proof is in Section V. There are two intermediate result: Theorem 16 shows the validity of our circuit-to-code construction and Theorem 20 constructs an efficient new fault-tolerant measurement gadget that uses expander graphs. While expander graphs have played an important role in classical error correction, to our knowledge this is their first use in quantum error correction.

We then demonstrate the power of Theorem 1 by applying it to two natural scenarios: first to concatenated codes and then to spatially local codes. By applying our construction to concatenated stabilizer codes, we obtain families of sparse subsystem codes with by far the best distance to date. The previous best distance for a sparse quantum code was due to Freedman, Meyer, and Luo [7], who constructed a family of stabilizer codes encoding a single logical qubit having minimum distance $d = O(\sqrt{n \log n})$. Our construction provides for the following improvement in parameters.

Theorem 2. *Quantum error correcting subsystem codes exist with gauge generators of weight $O(1)$ and minimum distance $d = n^{1-\epsilon}$ where $\epsilon = O(1/\sqrt{\log n})$.*

It is natural to ask if our construction can also be made spatially local. By spatially local we mean that all of the qubits can be arranged on the vertices of a square lattice in D dimensions with each gauge generator having support in a region of size $O(1)$. Incorporating spatial locality is indeed also possible, though it will in general increase the size of the circuit we use, and hence the total number of qubits in the subsystem code.

Theorem 3. *Spatially local subsystem codes exist in $D \geq 2$ dimensions with gauge generators of weight $O(1)$ and minimum distance $d = n^{1-\epsilon-1/D}$ where $\epsilon = O(1/\sqrt{\log n})$.*

Although the spatial locality constraint comes at the cost of decreased performance in the rate and relative distance, this scaling of the distance is nearly optimal. Several upper bounds have been proven about the parameters of spatially local subsystem codes in D dimensions. For this case, Bravyi and Terhal [8] have shown that $d \leq O(n^{1-1/D})$. Our codes nearly saturate this bound and have the virtue that they are in general constructive. In particular, our codes in $D = 3$ dimensions already improve on the previous best results (by Ref. [7] again) for *arbitrary* sparse codes and achieve $d = n^{2/3-\epsilon}$ for $\epsilon = O(1/\sqrt{\log n})$.

Furthermore, for the class of local commuting projector codes in D dimensions (a class that generalizes stabilizer codes, but does *not* contain general subsystem codes), Bravyi, Poulin, and Terhal [9] have shown the inequality $kd^{2/(D-1)} \leq O(n)$. It is open whether a similar upper bound holds for subsystem codes, but a corollary of our main results is that there are spatially local subsystem codes for every $D \geq 2$ that obey $kd^{2/(D-1)} \geq \Omega(n)$.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II we review the theory of subsystem codes and the prior art. We define the construction for our codes in Section III and review the relevant properties of the construction in Section IV. Those sections provide a proof of Theorem 1 conditional on the existence of certain fault-tolerant circuits for measuring stabilizer-code

syndromes, which we subsequently show exist in Section V, thus completing the proof. Sections VI and VII are devoted to the proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 respectively, and we conclude with a discussion of open problems in Section VIII.

II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

A. Quantum Subsystem Codes

For a system of n qubits, we can consider the group $\mathcal{P}^n$ of all n-fold tensor products of single-qubit real-valued Pauli operators $\{I, X, iY, Z\}$ and including the phases $\{\pm 1\}$. A *stabilizer code* (see e.g. [10]) is the joint $+1$ eigenspace of a group of commuting Pauli operators $\mathcal{S} = \langle S_1, \ldots, S_l \rangle$, where the S_i label a generating set for the group. (To avoid trivial codes, we require that $-I \notin \mathcal{S}$.) If each of the l generators are independent, then the code space is 2^k-dimensional where $k = n - l$, and there exist k pairs of *logical operators* which generate a group $\mathcal{L} = \langle X_1, Z_1, \ldots, X_k, Z_k \rangle$. In general, the logical group is isomorphic to $N(\mathcal{S})/\mathcal{S}$ where $N(\mathcal{S})$ is the normalizer of $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathcal{P}^n$, meaning the set of all Paulis that commute with $\mathcal{S}$ as a set. The logical group is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}^k$, meaning that for each logical operator in $\mathcal{L}$ we have that $[L_i, L_j] = 0$ for all $i \neq j$, and $X_i Z_i = -Z_i X_i$ for all i. The fact that $\mathcal{L} \subseteq N(\mathcal{S})$ means that $[L_i, S_j] = 0$ for all $S_j \in \mathcal{S}$. The *weight* of a Pauli operator is the number of non-identity tensor factors, and the *distance* of a code is the weight of the minimum weight element among all possible non-trivial logical operators (i.e. those which are not pure stabilizers).

A *subsystem code* [5, 11] is a generalization of a stabilizer code where we ignore some of the logical qubits and treat them as "gauge" degrees of freedom. More precisely, in a subsystem code the stabilized subspace $\mathcal{H}_S$ further decomposes into a tensor product $\mathcal{H}_S = \mathcal{H}_L \otimes \mathcal{H}_G$, where by convention we still require that $\mathcal{H}_L$ is a 2^k-dimensional space, and the space $\mathcal{H}_G$ contains the unused logical qubits called gauge qubits. The gauge qubits give rise to a *gauge group* $\mathcal{G}$ generated by former logical operators G_i (which obey the Pauli algebra commutation relations for a set of qubits) together with the stabilizer operators. We note that $-I$ is always in the gauge group, assuming that there is at least one gauge qubit. The logical operators in a subsystem code are given by $\mathcal{L} = N(\mathcal{G})$ and still preserve the code space. The center of the gauge group $Z(\mathcal{G})$ is defined to be the subgroup of all elements in $\mathcal{G}$ that commute with everything in $\mathcal{G}$. Since $Z(\mathcal{G})$ contains $-I$, it cannot be the set of stabilizers for any nontrivial subspace. Instead we define the stabilizer subgroup $\mathcal{S}$ to be isomorphic to $Z(\mathcal{G})/\{\pm I\}$. Concretely, if $Z(\mathcal{G})$ has generators $\langle -I, S_1, \ldots, S_l \rangle$ then we define the stabilizer group to be $\langle \epsilon_1 S_1, \ldots, \epsilon_l S_l \rangle$ for some arbitrary choice of $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_l \in \{\pm 1\}$.

A classic example of a subsystem code is the Bacon-Shor code [12] having physical qubits on the vertices of an $L \times L$ lattice (so $n = L^2$). The gauge group is generated by neighboring pairs of XX and ZZ operators across the horizontal and vertical links respectively. The logical quantum information is encoded by a string of X operators along a horizontal line and a string of Z operators along a vertical line, and the code distance is $L = \sqrt{n}$.

We differentiate between two types of logical operators in a subsystem code: *bare* logical operators are those that act trivially on the gauge qubits, while *dressed* logical operators may in general act nontrivially on both the logical and gauge qubits. In other words, the bare logical group is $N(\mathcal{G})/\mathcal{S}$ while the dressed logical group is $N(\mathcal{S})/\mathcal{S}$. The distance of a subsystem code is the minimum weight among all nontrivial dressed logical operators, i.e. $\min\{|g| : g \in N(\mathcal{S}) - \mathcal{S}\}$. We say that a code is a $[n, k, d]$ code if it uses n physical qubits to encode k logical qubits and has distance d.

B. Sparse Quantum Codes and Related Work

The sparsity of a code is defined with respect to a given set of gauge generators. If each generator has weight at most s_g and each qubit partakes in at most s_q generators, then we define $s = \max\{s_g, s_q\}$ and say the code is s-sparse. We call a code family simply *sparse* if $s = O(1)$.

The most important examples of sparse codes are topological stabilizer codes, also called homology codes because of their relation to homology theory. The archetype for this code family is Kitaev's toric code [13], which encodes $k = O(1)$ qubits and has minimum distance $d = O(\sqrt{n})$ (although it can correct a constant fraction of random errors). It is known that $2D$ homological codes obey $d \leq O(\sqrt{n})$ [14]. Many other important examples of such codes are known; see Ref. [1] for a survey.

The discovery of subsystem codes [5, 11] led to the study of sparse subsystem codes, first in the context of topological subsystem codes, of which there are now many examples [12, 15–22]. These codes are all concerned with the case $k = O(1)$ and all achieve distance $d = O(\sqrt{n})$.

Work on codes with large k initially focused on random codes, where it was shown that random stabilizers have $k, d \propto n$ [23–25], and more recently that short random circuits generate good codes (meaning that k and d are both proportional to n) [26]. There are also known constructive examples of good stabilizer codes such as those constructed by Ashikhmin, Litsyn, and Tsfasman [27] and others [28–31]. All of these codes have stabilizer generators with weight $\propto n$, however.

A growing body of work has made simultaneous improvement on increasing k and d while keeping the code sparse. The best distance known to be achievable with a sparse code is due to Freedman, Meyer and Luo [7], encoding a single qubit with distance $O(\sqrt{n \log n})$. The only other candidate for beating distance $\sqrt{n}$ with a sparse code is Haah's cubic code [32] which achieves distance n^α where currently the only known bounds for α are that $0.01 \leq \alpha \leq 0.56$ [33–35]. A different construction called hypergraph product codes by Tillich and Zémor [36] achieves a distance of $O(\sqrt{n})$ but with constant rate. These codes, like the toric code, can still correct a constant fraction of random errors [37] but they abandon spatial locality in general.

Some notion of spatial locality can be recovered by working with more exotic geometries than a simple cubic lattice in Euclidean space. Zémor constructed a family of hyperbolic surface codes with constant rate and logarithmic distance [39]; see also [40]. Guth and Lubotzky [41] have improved this by constructing sparse codes with constant rate and $d = O(n^{3/10})$. Hastings [38] has shown that the 4D toric code in hyperbolic space can be made to have a constant rate with a distance of only $d = O(\log(n))$, but with an efficient decoder. These codes and those of Ref. [7] live most naturally on cellulations of Riemannian manifolds with non-Euclidean metrics and unfortunately cannot be embedded into a cubic lattice in $D \leq 3$ without high distortion.

The Bacon-Shor codes [12] mentioned in the previous section were generalized by Bravyi [42] to yield a family of sparse subsystem codes encoding $k \propto \sqrt{n}$ qubits while still respecting the geometric locality of the gauge generators in $D = 2$ dimensions and maintaining the distance $d = \sqrt{n}$. This is an example of how subsystem codes can outperform stabilizer codes under spatial locality constraints, since two-dimensional stabilizer codes were proven in [42] to satisfy $kd^2 \leq O(n)$ (which generalizes [9] in D dimensions to $kd^{2/(D-1)} \leq O(n)$). Bravyi [42] has also shown that all spatially local subsystem codes in $D = 2$ dimensions obey the bound $kd \leq O(n)$ for $D = 2$ and so this scaling is optimal for two dimensions.

A family of $O(\sqrt{n})$-sparse codes called homological product codes, due to Bravyi and Hastings [43], leverage random codes with added structure to create good stabilizer codes with a non-trivial amount of sparsity, but no spatial locality of the generators.

By way of comparison, classical sparse codes exist that are able to achieve linear rate and distance, and can be encoded and decoded from a constant fraction of errors in linear time [44].

III. CONSTRUCTING THE CODES

In this section we describe how our new codes are constructed. Our codes are built from existing stabilizer codes, and indeed our construction can be thought of as a recipe for sparsifying stabilizer codes. Our requirements for the initial base code are described in Section III A. Then our construction is presented in Section III B.

A. The Base Code and Error-Detecting Circuits

Our code begins with an initial code called C_0 which is a stabilizer code with stabilizer group $\mathcal{S}_0$ and logical group $\mathcal{L}_0$. By a slight abuse of notation, we use C_0 to also refer to the actual code space. It uses n_0 qubits to encode k_0 logical qubits with distance d_0. Assume that there exists an error-detecting circuit consisting of the following elements:

- A total of n_a ancilla qubits initialized in the $|0\rangle$ state.
- A total of n_0 data qubits.
- A Clifford unitary U_{ED} applied to the data qubits and ancillas.
- Single-qubit postselections onto the $|0\rangle$ state.

Denote the resulting operator V_{ED}. By ordering the qubits appropriately we have

$$V_{\mathrm{ED}} = (I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes \langle 0|^{\otimes n_a}) U_{\mathrm{ED}} (I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes n_a}) \,. \tag{1}$$

This satisfies $V_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger V_{\mathrm{ED}} \leq I$ automatically.

Definition 4. *A circuit V_{ED} is a* good error-detecting circuit *for C_0 if $V_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger V_{\mathrm{ED}}$ is proportional (with nonzero constant of proportionality) to the projector onto C_0.*

This means that the circuit always rejects states orthogonal to C_0 and accepts every state in C_0 with the same nonzero probability, assuming no errors occur while running the circuit. In other words,

$$V_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger V_{\mathrm{ED}} = (I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes \langle 0|^{\otimes n_a}) U_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger (I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes n_a}) U_{\mathrm{ED}} (I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes n_a}) \propto \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_0|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_0} s \,. \tag{2}$$

We allow the initializations and postselections to occur at staggered times across the circuit, so that the circuit is *not* simply a rectangular block in general. Describing this in sufficient detail for our purposes will require somewhat cumbersome notation. All initializations, postselections, and elementary gates take place at *half-integer time steps*. Thus, a single-qubit gate acting at time, say, $t = 2.5$, can be thought of as mapping the state from time $t = 2$ to $t = 3$. The ith qubit is input or initialized at time $T_i^{\mathrm{in}} - 0.5$ and output or measured at time $T_i^{\mathrm{out}} + 0.5$. The total depth of the circuit is then $\max_i T_i^{\mathrm{out}} - \min_i T_i^{\mathrm{in}} + 1$.

We defer a discussion of fault-tolerance in our circuits until Sec. V.






Circuit element	Gauge generators
	XX, ZZ
	ZX, XZ
	YX, ZZ
	$\begin{matrix} XX & I\,I & ZZ & Z\,I \\ X\,I\,, & XX, & I\,I\,, & ZZ \end{matrix}$
	Z
	Z

TABLE I. Dictionary for transforming circuit elements into generators of the gauge group. For every input and output of a circuit element in the left column, we add the corresponding generators from the right column, placed on the appropriate physical qubits. (This is the purpose of the η_t^i map in the main text.) We only list the gauge generators for the standard generators of the Clifford group, but the circuit identities of any Clifford circuit can be used instead. Pre- and postselections are special and have only one gauge generator associated to them.

B. Localized codes

To construct our code, we place a physical qubit at each integer spacetime location in the circuit. Thus, each wire of the circuit now supports up to T physical qubits, and in general the ith wire will hold $T_i^{\text{out}} - T_i^{\text{in}} + 1$ physical qubits. Assume each $T_i^{\text{in}} \geq 0$ and let $T = \max_i T_i^{\text{out}}$. Then each qubit is active for some subset of times $\{0, \ldots, T\}$. In some of our analysis it will be convenient to pretend that each qubit is present for the entire time $\{0, \ldots, T\}$, and that all initializations and measurements happen at times -0.5 and $T + 0.5$ respectively. During the "dummy" time steps the qubits are acted upon with identity gates. It is straightforward to see that the code properties (except for total number of physical qubits) are identical with or without these dummy time steps. Thus, we will present our proofs as though dummy qubits are present, but will perform our resource accounting without them.

We introduce the function $\eta_t^i(P)$ to denote placing a Pauli P at spacetime position (i, t). If P is a multi-qubit Pauli then we let $\eta^i(P)$ or $\eta_t(P)$ denote placing it either on row i coming from circuit qubit i or on column t corresponding to circuit time slice t. For a two-qubit gate U, we write $\eta_t^{i,j}(U)$ to mean that we place U at locations (i, t) and (j, t). When describing a block of qubits without this spacetime structure, we also use the more traditional notation of P_i to denote Pauli P acting on position i: that is, $P_i := I^{\otimes i-1} \otimes P \otimes I^{\otimes n-i}$, where n is usually understood from context.

With this notation in hand, we define the gauge group of our codes. This is summarized in Table I, and defined more precisely below. The gauge group will have $2k$ generators per k-qubit gate and one for each measurement or initialization. Let U be a single qubit gate that acts on




FIG. 1. Illustration of the circuit-to-code mapping. Using integral spacetime coordinates (j,t), the open circles at integer time steps (j,t) are physical qubits of the subsystem code, while gates of the circuit are "syncopated" and live at half-integer time steps (j,t). The three sets of qubits in the dashed boxes labelled D, A, and M correspond to the input qubits for the base code, the ancillas, and the measurements (postselections) respectively. For this circuit, for example, we have among others the gauge generators $\eta_1^1(X)\eta_1^2(Z)$ and $\eta_1^1(Z)\eta_1^2(X)$ because these are the circuit identities for the Hadamard gate at spacetime location $(1,1/2)$. Note that we pad each line with identity gates to ensure that there are always an even number of gates on each line, which is important to maintain our code properties. We draw our circuit diagram with time moving from right to left to match the way that operators are composed; e.g. if we apply U_1 then U_2 then U_3 the resulting composite operator is $U_3U_2U_1$. (see Section IV for details).

qubit i as it transitions from time t to time $t+1$. Corresponding to this gate, we add the gauge generators

$$\eta_{t+1}^i(UXU^\dagger)\eta_t^i(X) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \eta_{t+1}^i(UZU^\dagger)\eta_t^i(Z). \tag{3a}$$

Similarly for a two-qubit gate U acting on qubits i,j at time $t+1/2$, we add the generators

$$\{\eta_{t+1}^{i,j}(UPU^\dagger)\eta_t^{i,j}(P) : P \in \{X\otimes I, Z\otimes I, I\otimes X, I\otimes Z\}_{i,j}\}\,. \tag{3b}$$

More generally, a k-qubit gate U acting on qubits $i_1,\ldots,i_k$ at time $t+1/2$ has generators

$$\{\eta_{t+1}^{i_1,\ldots,i_k}(UPU^\dagger)\eta_t^{i_1,\ldots,i_k}(P) : P = I^{\otimes j-1}\otimes Q\otimes I^{\otimes k-j}, j\in[k], Q\in\{X,Z\}\}\,. \tag{3c}$$

For measurements or initializations of qubit i we add generators $\eta_{T_i^{\text{out}}}^i(Z)$ or $\eta_{T_i^{\text{in}}}^i(Z)$ respectively.

An illustration of the mapping from the circuit to the code is given in Fig. 1.

IV. CODE PROPERTIES

In this section we prove that our codes match—in the sense of Theorem 1—the performance of the base codes with respect to k and d. There are four intermediate steps. In Section IV A we explain the way in which our localized codes inherit the properties of the circuits used to build them. Then in Section IV B we will show that they inherit the properties of the original code

used. Specifically we will show that the logical and stabilizer groups for the new code are in a sense isomorphic to the corresponding groups of the base code. Next, Section IV C will show that the new code inherits the distance properties of the original code *if* we build it using a fault-tolerant error-detecting circuit. Proving distance is usually the nontrivial part of any code construction, and ours is no exception. However, our approach allows us to import results from the significant literature on fault-tolerant quantum computing and derive distance bounds from them. One caveat is that our construction is subject to a slightly different set of rules than conventional fault-tolerant quantum computing: we are permitted to perform post-selections that may succeed with exponentially small probability, but can only use Clifford operations and cannot take advantage of classical control. Thus, in order to make our result self-contained, Section V describes a general construction of fault-tolerant measurement gadgets (loosely based on the DiVincenzo-Shor syndrome measurement scheme [45, 46]) with the performance we need.

A. The circuit-code isomorphism

We describe first a change of basis for (3) that will be useful later. Let $U_{t+1/2}$ denote the global unitary that is applied between time step t and time step $t+1$, i.e. the product of all gates occurring at time $t+1/2$. Then we can rewrite (3) as

$$\{\eta_{t+1}(U_{t+1/2} P U_{t+1/2}^\dagger)\eta_t(P) : P \in \mathcal{P}^{n_0+n_a}\}. \tag{4}$$

This is a massively overcomplete set of generators, some of which have high weight. But we will use it only in the analysis of the code, and will not measure the generators in (4) directly.

However, this form is useful to show that every operator that acts on the physical qubits is gauge-equivalent to one that acts just on the qubits at the first time-step of the circuit. Because the action of the gauge group cleans up the circuit by sliding all errors in one direction, we call this the squeegee lemma.

Lemma 5 (The Squeegee Lemma)**.** *There is a map $\varphi : \mathcal{P}^{\otimes(T+1)(n_0+n_a)} \to \mathcal{P}^{\otimes(T+1)(n_0+n_a)}$ such that $\varphi(P)$ is in the image of η_0 and also $P\,\varphi(P) \in \mathcal{G}$ for every Pauli operator P.*

Furthermore $P\,\varphi(P)$ is a product of gauge generators corresponding to unitary gates.

Proof: Say that an operator Q is localized to times $\leq t$ if Q is in the image of $\eta_{0,\ldots,t}$. Then P is localized to times $\leq T$. Let $Q|_t$ denote the restriction of an operator Q on the circuit to time slice t. Then define

$$\varphi_t(Q) := Q\,\eta_t(Q|_t)\,\eta_{t-1}(U_{t-1/2}^\dagger Q|_t U_{t-1/2}). \tag{5}$$

Since $\eta_t(Q|_t)$ cancels the slice-t component of Q, if Q was localized to times $\leq t$ then $\varphi(Q)$ is localized to times $\leq t-1$. And by (4), we see that $Q\,\varphi(Q) \in \mathcal{G}$ and is in fact a product of gauge generators corresponding to unitary gates in the circuit. So take $\varphi = \varphi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_T$. Then $\varphi(P)$ is localized to time slice 0 and $P\,\varphi(P)$ is a product of unitary gate gauge generators. □

Next, the set $\mathcal{P}^{n_0+n_a}$ is invariant under conjugation by Cliffords. Thus we can replace (4) with

$$\{\eta_{t+1}(U_{\leq t+1/2} P U_{\leq t+1/2}^\dagger)\eta_t(U_{\leq t-1/2} P U_{\leq t-1/2}^\dagger) : P \in \mathcal{P}^{n_0+n_a}\}, \tag{6}$$

where $U_{\leq t+1/2} := U_{t+1/2} U_{t-1/2} \cdots U_{1/2}$. We could equivalently take P to range over only the individual X and Z operators. This time, though, the action of $U_{\leq t+1/2}$ would make the resulting operators still high weight. Thus the generators in (6) should also not be measured directly, but will be useful for proving certain operators are contained in $\mathcal{G}$.

Overall the gauge group can be interpreted as representing the action of the error-detection circuit V_{ED}. Each generator of the gauge group in (3) is meant to propagate a single Pauli through a single gate of the circuit. The generators in (4) and (6) correspond to propagating a column of Paulis through one time step of the circuit. More generally, we could consider the effects of the circuit on an arbitrary pattern of Paulis occurring throughout the circuit.

Definition 6. *Define a Pauli pattern (also sometimes called an error pattern) E to be a collection of Pauli matrices, one for each circuit location. Let $E_{i,t}$ denote the Pauli occurring at time t (assumed to be integer) and qubit i. We can interpret E either as a sequence of Paulis that occur at different times, or as the unitary $E = \prod_{i,t} \eta_t^i(E_{i,t})$. Let $E_t := \bigotimes_i E_{i,t}$. For a unitary circuit $U = U_{T-1/2} \cdots U_{1/2}$ define $U_E := E_T U_{T-1/2} E_{T-1} \cdots U_{1/2} E_0$.*

Armed with this definition, we can see one form of the isomorphism between a Clifford circuit V and the corresponding gauge group $\mathcal{G}$ with the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the gauge group corresponding to a Clifford circuit V. For any error pattern E and any gauge pattern G (i.e. the Pauli pattern corresponding to an element of $\mathcal{G}$) we have*

$$V_E = \pm V_{GE}\,. \tag{7}$$

Proof: By induction it suffices to consider the case when G is a single gauge generator of the form (3). Write $V = A_f U_{T-1/2} \cdots U_{1/2} A_i$ where $A_f = I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes \langle 0|^{n_a}$ and $A_i = A_f^\dagger$. Thus we have

$$V_{GE} = A_f G_T E_T U_{T-1/2} G_{T-1} E_{T-1} \cdots U_{1/2} G_0 E_0 A_i.$$

Suppose that G corresponds to a single unitary gate at time $t+1/2$ so that the only nonidentity G_τ are for $\tau = t, t+1$. Then the expansions of V_E and V_{GE} differ only surrounding the gate $U_{t+1/2}$ where they look like

$$E_{t+1} U_{t+1/2} E_t \qquad \text{and} \qquad G_{t+1} E_{t+1} U_{t+1/2} G_t E_t\,, \tag{8}$$

respectively. But G_{t+1} and G_t are not independent since they are in the gauge group. Namely, $G_{t+1} = U_{t+1/2} G_t U_{t+1/2}^\dagger$, as can be seen from the defining equations (3). Then depending on whether E_{t+1} and G_{t+1} commute (+) or anticommute (−), we have

$$G_{t+1} E_{t+1} U_{t+1/2} G_t E_t = \pm E_{t+1} G_{t+1} U_{t+1/2} G_t E_t = \pm E_{t+1} U_{t+1/2} E_t\,. \tag{9}$$

Thus V_E and V_{GE} differ by at most a sign.

If G is the generator corresponding to an initialization or measurement, then the situation is similar. For a measurement, $G = \eta_T^i(Z)$ and $A_f G = A_f$. For an initialization, $G = \eta_0^i(Z)$ and we need to commute G past E_0 before it reaches the A_i and is annihilated. That is $G_0 E_0 A_i = \pm E_0 G_0 A_i = \pm E_0 A_i$.

Since this covers a complete generating set, we conclude that (7) holds for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$. □

B. Characterizing the logical and stabilizer groups

1. Spackling

We can think of our codes as being based on the following primitive: for each section of wire between gates in a given quantum circuit, we simply replace that wire with a physical qubit. More precisely, we interpret each circuit element as consisting of a gate together with input and output

wires, and allow adding explicit identity gates. We note that initializations only have output wires, while postselections only have input wires. For adjacent circuit elements, an output wire of the preceding element is identical to the input wire of the following element, to avoid double-counting.

The isomorphism between the base code and the new code is based on the operation of taking some Pauli operator on the circuit input, propagating it through to each time step of the circuit, and leaving a copy of the operator at each time step in the appropriate spacetime locations in the new code. We call this operation "spackling" because it resembles the process of spreading a line of putty over a 2-dimensional region and letting it dry in a site-specific way.

Here is a more concrete definition of spackling. Suppose that $U_{\mathrm{ED}} = U_{T-1/2}U_{T-3/2}\dots U_{1/2}$, where U_t is the product of all gates performed in time step t. Equivalently, $U_{\mathrm{ED}} = U_{\leq T-1/2}$. Let P be a Pauli operator on the input qubits (including ancillas) of the circuit, i.e. $P \in \mathcal{P}^{n_0+n_a}$. Then

$$\mathrm{spackle}(P) := \prod_{t=0}^{T} \eta_t(U_{\leq t-1/2} P U_{\leq t-1/2}^\dagger)\,. \tag{10}$$

Here we adopt the convention that $U_{-1/2} = I$.

A simple example of spackling comes from a plain wire with no gates, or more precisely, with all identity gates. Then $\mathrm{spackle}(P) = P^{\otimes T+1}$ for $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Observe that spackle preserves commutation relations if T is even. More generally (10) shows how spackle preserves the commutation relations of the Pauli algebra on the input qubits. In this sense it can be viewed as an injective homomorphism.

Another useful property of the spackling map is that its outputs are gauge-equivalent to its inputs. Again this relies on T being even, and can be illustrated on a single wire, where $\eta_0(P)$ is gauge-equivalent to $P^{\otimes T+1}$ for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$. More generally we have:

Lemma 8. *For $P \in \mathcal{P}^{n_0+n_a}$, $\mathrm{spackle}(P)\eta_0(P) \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof: By first (10) and then the fact that T is even, we have

$$\mathrm{spackle}(P)\cdot\eta_0(P) = \prod_{t=1}^{T} \eta_t(U_{\leq t-1/2} P U_{\leq t-1/2}^\dagger) \tag{11}$$

$$= \prod_{t'=1}^{T/2} \eta_{2t'}(U_{\leq 2t'-1/2} P U_{\leq 2t'-1/2}^\dagger)\eta_{2t'-1}(U_{\leq 2t'-3/2} P U_{\leq 2t'-3/2}^\dagger). \tag{12}$$

By (6), this is contained in the gauge group. □

2. Proving the isomorphism

Recall that our base code consists of a code C_0 with n_0 physical qubits, k_0 logical qubits, and distance d_0, together with an error-detecting circuit for fault-tolerantly measuring the stabilizer generators. From this base code, we follow a sequence of intermediate codes and build our final code in stages. For $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ we define code C_i with gauge group $\mathcal{G}_i$, stabilizer group $\mathcal{S}_i \cong Z(\mathcal{G}_i)/\{\pm I\}$ and logical group $\mathcal{L}_i = N(\mathcal{G}_i)/\mathcal{S}_i$, and standard code parameters n_i, k_i, and d_i. We then build our code from the circuit for C_0 in the following stages:

- C_1 consists of just wires, i.e., a circuit with only identity gates.
- C_2 adds the unitary gates from the circuit.
- C_3 adds the initializations.

- $C := C_4$ adds the postselections.

Let's analyze the code properties of each of these. There are $n_1 = n_0 + n_a$ lines (wires), each consisting of an odd numbers of qubits, corresponding to circuits in which each line has an even number of circuit elements. In C_1, suppose the wires have lengths $l_1, \ldots, l_{n_0+n_a}$. The gauge group $\mathcal{G}_1$ is generated by $\{XX, ZZ\}$ on nearest-neighbor qubits along wires. The logical group is $\mathcal{L}_1 = \langle \{\eta^i(X^{\otimes l_i}), \eta^i(Z^{\otimes l_i}) : i \in [n_0 + n_a]\}\rangle$. The stabilizer group $\mathcal{S}_1$ is empty. These claims rely on the fact that each l_i is odd, since if the l_i were even then the elements of the logical group would commute with each other.

To get C_2, we add the actual unitary gates from the circuit. The new gauge group $\mathcal{G}_2$ is related to $\mathcal{G}_1$ by conjugation. We do not conjugate each element of $\mathcal{G}_1$ by the same unitary. Instead, label the generators $\eta^i_{t+1}(X)\eta^i_t(X), \eta^i_{t+1}(Z)\eta^i_t(Z)$ of $\mathcal{G}_1$ by a half-integer time t. For each $P \in \{X, Z\}^{\otimes n_1}$ and each half-integer gate time t there is a generator $\eta_{t+1}(P) \otimes \eta_t(P)$ of $\mathcal{G}_1$. For $\mathcal{G}_2$ we replace this generator with $\eta_{t+1}(UPU^\dagger) \otimes \eta_t(P)$, as illustrated in Table I. For example, if we apply a Hadamard gate, then the generators $X \otimes X, Z \otimes Z$ are replaced with $Z \otimes X, X \otimes Z$. For a CNOT gate, we replace the generators

$$\begin{matrix} X & X \\ I & I \end{matrix} \qquad \begin{matrix} Z & Z \\ I & I \end{matrix} \qquad \begin{matrix} I & I \\ X & X \end{matrix} \qquad \begin{matrix} I & I \\ Z & Z \end{matrix} \tag{13}$$

with the generators

$$\begin{matrix} X & X \\ X & I \end{matrix} \qquad \begin{matrix} Z & Z \\ I & I \end{matrix} \qquad \begin{matrix} I & I \\ X & X \end{matrix} \qquad \begin{matrix} Z & I \\ Z & Z \end{matrix} . \tag{14}$$

The logical group is similarly twisted and now is

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \langle \{\text{spackle}(P_i) : P \in \{X, Z\}, i \in [n_0 + n_a]\}\rangle , \tag{15}$$

which follows from the next lemma.

Lemma 9. *For any P acting on the input qubits,* spackle(P) *commutes with all elements of $\mathcal{G}_2$. Furthermore, an operator on the circuit commutes with all elements of $\mathcal{G}_2$* only if *it is equal to* spackle(P) *for some P.*

Proof: Let $g \in \mathcal{G}_2$ be a gauge generator, corresponding to a gate at some time $t + 1/2$. Let $Q|_t$ denote the restriction of some Pauli operator Q to the t^{th} time step. By definition, $\text{spackle}(P)|_t = \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^t U_{\tau-1/2}\right) P \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^t U_{\tau-1/2}\right)^\dagger$ and similarly for $\text{spackle}(P)|_{t+1}$. It follows that $\text{spackle}(P)|_{t+1} = U_{t+1/2}\,\text{spackle}(P)|_t U^\dagger_{t+1/2}$.

By definition, also $g = \eta_{t+1}(U_{t+1/2}QU^\dagger_{t+1/2})\eta_t(Q)$ for some Pauli Q. Since g is only supported on time steps t and $t + 1$, it suffices to verify that g commutes with $\text{spackle}(P)|_t\,\text{spackle}(P)|_{t+1}$. This is verified by noting that conjugation by $U_{t+1/2}$ is a group isomorphism and hence preserves commutation/anticommutation relations.

To argue the other direction, suppose Q is some operator which is not a spackle. We note that the condition $\text{spackle}(P)|_{t+1} = U_{t+1/2}\,\text{spackle}(P)|_t U^\dagger_{t+1/2}$ for every P is actually equivalent to the definition of spackle. Thus there is some t such that $Q|_{t+1} \neq U_{t+1/2}Q|_t U^\dagger_{t+1/2}$. Since $Q|_t\, U^\dagger_{t+1/2}Q|_{t+1}U_{t+1/2}$, is localized to the tth time step and is not equal to the identity, there is some Pauli operator A so that $\eta_t(A)$ anticommutes with it. It follows that $\eta_t(A)$ anticommutes with exactly one of $Q|_t$ or $U^\dagger_{t+1/2}Q|_{t+1}U_{t+1/2}$. Therefore Q anticommutes with $g = \eta_{t+1}(U_{t+1/2}AU^\dagger_{t+1/2})\eta_t(A)$. □

The stabilizer group $\mathcal{S}_2$ is still empty. The following lemma is an immediate consequence of the squeegee lemma (Lemma 5) and Lemma 8.

Lemma 10. *Let P be a Pauli operator acting on the input qubits. Then $\eta_0(P)$,* spackle(P)*, and $\eta_T(U_{\mathrm{ED}} P U_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger)$ are all equivalent modulo $\mathcal{G}_2$. That is, the product of any pair of them is contained in $\mathcal{G}_2$.*

Adding initializations brings us to C_3. Of course, there is nothing fundamentally different from our code's perspective between initializations and postselections, since both consist of adding Z operators locally, and because our gates are reversible. The only asymmetry comes from our decision to analyze initializations first. Each initialization removes one generator from the logical group and adds it to the stabilizer group. (The conjugate element of the logical group becomes the corresponding error.) The initializations commute with each other. Now the logical and stabilizer groups are

$$\mathcal{L}_3 = \langle \text{spackle}(P_i) : P \in \{X, Z\}, i \in [n_0] \rangle \tag{16}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_3 = \langle \text{spackle}(Z_{n_0+i}) : i \in [n_a] \rangle \,. \tag{17}$$

Every new element of the gauge group is equivalent (modulo $\mathcal{G}_2$) to one of these stabilizers, so the new gauge group is simply $\mathcal{G}_3 = \langle \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3 \rangle$.

So far we have not used any specific properties of the circuit. The final code $C = C_4$ adds the postselections, aka measurements. Let M be the set of qubits where postselections take place (in our case always equal to the set of ancilla qubits), and let $\mathcal{M}$ be the group generated by $\{Z_i : i \in M\}$. Then $\mathcal{G}_4 = \langle \mathcal{G}_3 \cup \eta_T(\mathcal{M}) \rangle$. (Here we have used the assumption that measurements all occur at the final time T.) In general adding elements to the gauge group will cause the elements to move from the logical group to the stabilizer group and from the stabilizer group to the (pure) gauge group (i.e. $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{S}$).

Lemma 11. *If*

$$V_{\mathrm{ED}} = (I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes \langle 0|^{\otimes n_a}) U_{\mathrm{ED}} (I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes n_a})$$

is a good error-detecting Clifford circuit for C_0 and if $\mathcal{M}$ is the group generated by the Z operators on ancilla qubits (i.e. Z_j for $n_0 + 1 \le j \le n_0 + n_a$), then there exists a pair of subgroups $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}^\perp$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that

1. *$\mathcal{H} \cdot \mathcal{H}^\perp = \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{H}^\perp = \{I\}$;*
2. *The restriction of $U_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger \mathcal{H} U_{\mathrm{ED}}$ to the first n_0 qubits is equal to $\mathcal{S}_0$.*
3. *The restriction of $U_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger \mathcal{H} U_{\mathrm{ED}}$ to the last n_a qubits is a subgroup of $\mathcal{M}$.*
4. *Every non-identity element of $U_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger \mathcal{H}^\perp U_{\mathrm{ED}}$ anticommutes with some element of $\mathcal{M}$ but commutes with every element of $U_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger \mathcal{H} U_{\mathrm{ED}}$.*

Proof: Since $\mathcal{M}$ is isomorphic (as a group) to $\mathbb{Z}_2^{n_a}$, for every subgroup $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ there is a subgroup $\mathcal{A}^\perp$ such that $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A}^\perp = \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}^\perp = \{I\}$. Define also the group $\mathcal{N} = \pm \mathcal{P}^{n_0} \times \mathcal{M}$; i.e. the set of all Paulis with no X or Y on any ancilla qubit. Let r_0, r_a denote the restriction maps taking $\mathcal{P}^{n_0+n_a}$ to the first n_0 or the last n_a qubits respectively.

Let $u(A)$ denote $U_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger A U_{\mathrm{ED}}$ and define $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{M} \cap u^{-1}(\mathcal{N})$. In other words, $\mathcal{H}$ is the subgroup of $\mathcal{M}$ consisting of $H \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $r_a(u(H))$ contains no X or Y operations. Then every non-identity element of $u(\mathcal{H}^\perp)$ contains at least one X or Y operation on an ancilla. Already we can see that parts 1, 3 and 4 of the Lemma are true. In the rest of the proof we will show that $\mathcal{H}$ corresponds to stabilizers and $\mathcal{H}^\perp$ to gauge qubits, on the way to establishing part 2 of the Lemma.

For $A \in \mathcal{M}$, let Φ_A denote the projector to the $+1$ eigenspace of A, and for $\mathcal{A}$ a subgroup of $\mathcal{M}$, let $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ denote the projector to the common $+1$ eigenspace of every element in $\mathcal{A}$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is abelian we have

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{A}} = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \Phi_A = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A. \tag{18}$$

More generally if $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ are subgroups of $\mathcal{M}$ then $\Phi_{\mathcal{AB}} = \Phi_{\mathcal{A}} \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$.

For any operator Θ, define

$$\pi(\Theta) = (I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes \langle 0|^{\otimes n_a}) \Theta (I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes n_a}). \tag{19}$$

For $a, b \in \{0,1\}^{n_0}, a', b' \in \{0,1\}^{n_a}$ we can calculate

$$\pi(X^a Z^b \otimes X^{a'} Z^{b'}) = X^a Z^b \mathbb{1}_{a'=0}, \tag{20}$$

where $\mathbb{1}_p$ is the indicator function for proposition p. In particular, for a Pauli P, $\pi(u(P)) = r_0(u(P))\mathbb{1}_{P \in \mathcal{H}}$. It follows that for a subgroup $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ we have

$$\pi(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{A}})) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(u(A)) = \frac{|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{H}|}{|\mathcal{A}|} r_0(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{H}})). \tag{21}$$

This implies that

$$V_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger V_{\mathrm{ED}} = \pi(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{M}})) = \frac{|\mathcal{H}|}{|\mathcal{M}|} r_0(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{H}})) \tag{22a}$$

$$\pi(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{H}})) = r_0(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{H}})) \tag{22b}$$

$$\pi(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{H}^\perp})) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}^\perp|} I^{\otimes n_0} = \frac{|\mathcal{H}|}{|\mathcal{M}|} I^{\otimes n_0} \tag{22c}$$

Since $V_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger V_{\mathrm{ED}}$ is proportional to the projector onto C_0 and $r_0(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{H}}))$ is a projector, this implies $r_0(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{H}}))$ is equal to the projector onto the codespace C_0.

We can now establish item 2 of the Lemma. This follows from $r_0(u(\Phi_{\mathcal{H}})) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}|} \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} r_0(u(H))$ being equal to the projector to the codespace of C_0, which is also equal to $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_0|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_0} s$ for $\mathcal{S}_0$ the stabilizer group of C_0. □

We now characterize the stabilizer group $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_4$ and logical group $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_4$ of the final code, after adding the postselections.

Lemma 12 (Isomorphism of codes)**.** *Let $\mathcal{M} = \langle Z_j : n_0 + 1 \le j \le n_0 + n_a \rangle$, and let $\mathcal{M}_a = r_a(\mathcal{M})$ denote the restriction of $\mathcal{M}$ to the ancilla qubits.*

For s a Pauli operator, $s \in \mathcal{S}_0$ if and only if there is some $Q \in \mathcal{M}_a$ such that spackle$(s \otimes Q) \in \mathcal{S}_4$. *Furthermore,* spackle$(s \otimes Q) \in \mathcal{S}_4$ *if and only if $s \otimes Q = U_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger H U_{\mathrm{ED}}$ for some $H \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $U_{\mathrm{ED}}^\dagger H U_{\mathrm{ED}}$ commutes with all of $\mathcal{M}$.*

For ℓ a Pauli operator, $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0$ if and only if there is some $Q \in \mathcal{M}_a$ such that spackle$(\ell \otimes Q)$ *is a bare logical operator of C_4. For each such ℓ the corresponding Q is unique.*

There are no other bare logical operators or stabilizers in C_4.

Proof: The group generated by the stabilizers $\mathcal{S}_4$ in combination with the bare logical operators is precisely the centralizer of $\mathcal{G}_4$, meaning the group of all Pauli operators that commute with each element of $\mathcal{G}_4$. As $\mathcal{G}_4$ was built up by successively adding new elements, its centralizer could only have shrunk as a result.

By Lemma 9, the centralizer of $\mathcal{G}_2$ is precisely the set of operators that can be expressed as spackle(P) for some Pauli $P \in \mathcal{P}^{n_0+n_a}$. When adding the initialization gauge generators, we had $\mathcal{G}_3 = \langle \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \eta_0(\mathcal{M}) \rangle$ and the centralizer of $\mathcal{G}_3$ was $\{\text{spackle}(P \otimes Q) : P \in \mathcal{P}^{\otimes n_0}, Q \in \mathcal{M}_a\}$. Finally, when adding the postselections, $\mathcal{G}_4 = \langle \mathcal{G}_3 \cup \eta_T(\mathcal{M}) \rangle$. We observe that for $P \in \mathcal{P}^{\otimes n_0}$, $Q \in \mathcal{M}_a$ and $H \in \mathcal{M}$ the following are equivalent:

- spackle($P \otimes Q$) commutes with $\eta_T(H)$;
- spackle($P \otimes Q$) commutes with $\eta_0(U_{\text{ED}}^\dagger H U_{\text{ED}})$;
- $P \otimes Q$ commutes with $U_{\text{ED}}^\dagger H U_{\text{ED}}$.

This is because both H and $U_{\text{ED}}^\dagger H U_{\text{ED}}$ are localized to single time slices of the circuit, conjugation by the unitary time evolution operator preserves commutation/anticommutation, and spackle($P \otimes Q$) is the concatenation of all time evolutions of $P \otimes Q$ through the circuit.

We would like to determine the conditions under which spackle($P \otimes Q$) commutes with $\eta_T(\mathcal{M})$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}^\perp$ be the subgroups from Lemma 11 of $\mathcal{M}$. From Lemma 11, for any $s \in \mathcal{S}_0$ there exists $H \in \mathcal{H}, Q \in \mathcal{M}_a$ such that $U_{\text{ED}}^\dagger H U_{\text{ED}} = s \otimes Q$, and thus $\eta_0(s \otimes Q) \in \mathcal{G}_4$. Since $\eta_0(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_4$ we conclude that $\eta_0(\mathcal{S}_0 \otimes I) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_4$. As a result, spackle($P \otimes Q$) commutes with all of $\mathcal{G}_4$ only if P commutes with all of $\mathcal{S}_0$. This means that the centralizer of $\mathcal{G}_4$ is generated by elements in spackle($\mathcal{L}_0 \otimes \mathcal{M}_a$) and spackle($\mathcal{S}_0 \otimes \mathcal{M}_a$). Therefore if we can show that every element of spackle($\mathcal{L}_0 \otimes \mathcal{M}_a$) that centralizes $\mathcal{G}_4$ is a bare logical operator of C_4 and every element of spackle($\mathcal{S}_0 \otimes \mathcal{M}_a$) that centralizes $\mathcal{G}_4$ is a stabilizer of C_4, this will be a full classification of the bare logical operators and stabilizers of C_4.

So suppose that $P \in \mathcal{S}_0$ and $Q \in \mathcal{M}_a$ and spackle($P \otimes Q$) commutes with every element of $\mathcal{G}_4$. Then by Lemma 11, there is some $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $P \otimes Q = U_{\text{ED}}^\dagger H U_{\text{ED}}$. This implies that spackle($P \otimes Q$) is gauge-equivalent to $\eta_T(H)$, which belongs to $\mathcal{G}_4$. Now we would like to show that spackle($P \otimes Q$) $\in \mathcal{S}_4$. To this end, first observe that from Lemma 11, $P \otimes Q$ commutes with $U_{\text{ED}}^\dagger \mathcal{M} U_{\text{ED}}$ and thus spackle($P \otimes Q$) commutes with $\eta_T(\mathcal{M})$. Since spackle($P \otimes Q$) already was known to commute with $\mathcal{G}_3$, this implies that spackle($P \otimes Q$) commutes with all of $\mathcal{G}_4$ and therefore belongs to $\mathcal{S}_4$.

Suppose next that $P \in \mathcal{L}_0 - \{I\}$. Then by Lemma 11, there is no way to choose $Q \in \mathcal{M}_a, H \in \mathcal{M}$ so that $P \otimes Q = U_{\text{ED}}^\dagger H U_{\text{ED}}$. By the contrapositive of the above discussion, this implies that $P \otimes Q$ is not gauge-equivalent to anything in $\mathcal{M}$. However, since all nonidentity elements of the group $U_{\text{ED}}^\dagger \mathcal{H}^\perp U_{\text{ED}}$ also anticommute with some element of $\mathcal{M}$, there is a $Q \in \mathcal{M}_a$ that makes spackle($P \otimes Q$) commute with every element of $\eta_T(\mathcal{H}^\perp)$. Indeed, for Paulis p, q define $\langle p, q \rangle$ to equal 0 if p and q commute and 1 if they anticommute. Now let $H_1^\perp, \ldots, H_k^\perp$ be a set of independent generators of $\mathcal{H}^\perp$, and construct $Q_1, \ldots, Q_k \in \mathcal{M}_a$ such that $\langle H_i^\perp, I \otimes Q_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$. We can then construct $Q := \sum_{i=1}^k \langle H_i^\perp, P \rangle Q_i \in \mathcal{M}_a$. By construction, $I \otimes Q$ commutes with all elements of $\mathcal{M}$, and since P commutes with all elements of $\mathcal{S}_0$, this implies that spackle($P \otimes Q$) commutes with every $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus spackle($P \otimes Q$) is a bare logical operator of C_4.

Finally, if spackle($P \otimes Q$) with $Q \in \mathcal{M}_a$ is a bare logical operator of C_4, there cannot be a different $Q' \in \mathcal{M}_a$ such that spackle($P \otimes Q'$) is also a bare logical operator. This is because then spackle($I \otimes QQ'$) would then also be a bare nonidentity logical operator, but this is impossible since $I \otimes QQ'$ is in $\mathcal{M}$ and therefore in the gauge group.

Since operators of the form spackle($s \otimes Q$) and spackle($\ell \otimes Q'$) for $s \in \mathcal{S}_0$, $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_0$, $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{M}_a$ generate the entire centralizer of $\mathcal{G}_4$, these operators suffice to generate all logical operators and stabilizers of C_4. □

In what follows we write $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{G}_4$, $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_4$, $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}_4$, since we will focus on the final code construction and not the intermediate steps used in the proof.

C. Distance

Definition 13. *Given a collection of errors $E = (E_t)_t$, define the weight $|E_t|$ to be the number of nonidentity terms in E_t and define $|E| = \sum_t |E_t|$.*

Definition 14. *A subcircuit V is fault-tolerant if for any error pattern E either $V_E = 0$ or there exists a Pauli operator E' on the input qubits such that $V_E = VE'$ and $|E'| \leq |E|$.*

This definition can be related to the conventional notion of fault-tolerant error detection. The primary idea is that an error does not propagate through the circuit to become equivalent to an error of higher weight. So either $V_E = 0$, meaning that a postselection failed and an error was detected, or $V_E = VE'$, so that the error E was equivalent to an error E' of no greater weight on the input. If the circuit V was supposed to detect errors of weight up to d on the input, then it can still detect combined errors of total weight up to d on both the input and the circuit itself.

A crucial feature of this definition is its composability.

Lemma 15. *If $V^{(1)}, \ldots, V^{(T)}$ are fault-tolerant subcircuits partitioning a circuit $U = V^{(T)} \cdots V^{(1)}$, then U is fault-tolerant as well.*

Proof: An error E on U partitions into errors $E_1, \ldots, E_T$ on the separate subcircuits. (Errors on wires in between subcircuits can be assigned arbitrarily to either of the connected subcircuits.) We can now repeatedly use Definition 14 to move errors back in time. That is, first find E'_T such that $V^{(T)}_{E_T} = V^{(T)} E'_T$. Then we can consider E'_T to be errors on the output wires of $V^{(T-1)}$, and can continue. In this way we move all the errors to the input of the full circuit U. It is possible that some subcircuit will evaluate to 0 during this process, in which case we have $U_E = 0$ as well. □

Theorem 16. *If V is a fault-tolerant error-detection circuit (i.e. satisfying Definitions 4 and 14) for a code with distance d then the corresponding localized code has distance d.*

Proof: Let E be a Pauli error on the localized code, which we can think of equivalently as an error pattern on the circuit V. Suppose that E is a dressed logical operator. We would like to show that either $E \in \mathcal{G}$ or $|E| \geq d$.

Let $A_f = I^{\otimes n_0} \otimes \langle 0|^{n_a}$ denote the postselections in V and let $A_i = A_f^\dagger$ denote the initializations so that $V = A_f U A_i$ for some unitary U.

From Definition 14, either $V_E = 0$ or there exists E_1 such that $V_E = VE_1$ and $|E_1| \leq |E|$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $V_E = 0$. Then by propagating all errors to the output qubits at time T (including the ancillas immediately prior to postselection), we obtain a Pauli operator E' so that $\eta_T(E')$ is gauge-equivalent to E and $V_E = A_f E' U A_i = 0$. Since A_f is a tensor product of Pauli postselections, $A_f E' U A_i = 0$ means there is a Pauli operator H so that A_f postselects into the $+1$ eigenspace of H but $E'UA_i$ is in the -1 eigenspace of H. Then since E' must either commute or anticommute with H and it doesn't commute since $V = A_f U A_i \neq 0$, we find that UA_i is in the $+1$ eigenspace of H. But $HUA_i = UA_i$ also implies $U^\dagger H U A_i = A_i$, so that $U^\dagger HU$ commutes with all initialization operators. By Lemma 12, spackle$(U^\dagger HU)$ is a stabilizer, and since E' anticommutes with H, $\eta_T(E')$ anticommutes with spackle$(U^\dagger HU)$, and hence E is not be a dressed logical operator as assumed. We conclude that $V_E \neq 0$.

Thus there is an E_1 acting on input qubits only that is gauge-equivalent to E and that satisfies $|E_1| \leq |E|$.

By Lemma 12 and Lemma 8, E_1 is a nontrivial dressed logical operator in C if and only if E_1 is a nontrivial logical operator in C_0. Therefore either $|E| \geq |E_1| \geq d$ or E_1 is a trivial logical operator. In the latter case, $E_1 \in \mathcal{G}$, which implies that $E \in \mathcal{G}$. □

V. FAULT-TOLERANT GADGETS

The final piece of our construction is a fault-tolerant gadget for measuring a single stabilizer generator, say of weight w. With this we can construct fault-tolerant circuits for any stabilizer code, and therefore sparse subsystem codes from any stabilizer code, completing the proof of Theorem 1.

The requirements for fault-tolerance here are markedly different from those surrounding existing fault-tolerant measurement strategies. Our circuits are restricted to stabilizer circuits, and cannot make use of classical feedback or post-processing. On the other hand, the circuits here only need to detect errors rather than correct them. The gadgets we use are hence a variation on the DiVincenzo-Shor cat-state method [45, 46], modified in several ways.

The original cat-state gadgets would prepare a w-qubit cat state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes w}+|1\rangle^{\otimes w})$ and perform a CNOT from each qubit in the cat state to each qubit that we want to measure. Making this fault-tolerant requires additional "ancilla verification" steps and also requires repeating the measurement multiple times and taking a majority vote. This uses non-Clifford gates (to compute majority) and also would require $O(w^2)$ size to measure a w-qubit stabilizer generator.

We will modify this circuit to use only $O(w)$ Clifford gates. This is achieved by making use of postselection. Indeed if implemented as an actual circuit the postselection steps would succeed with probability only 2^{-w} even on a state in the code space. However, in the context of our circuit-to-code map, this results only in the creation of w gauge qubits.

The idea of our modified gadget is to use $|+\rangle^{\otimes w}$ instead of the cat state. We call these qubits "vertex qubits" and also introduce "edge qubits" which play the role of ancilla verification. These correspond to an expander graph with w vertices and $O(w)$ edges. If the original stabilizer is $P_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes P_w$ for Paulis $P_1, \ldots, P_w$ then we will perform, for each i, a controlled P_i from vertex qubit i to data qubit i. In the same step we will perform CNOTs from vertex qubit i to the edge qubits corresponding to incident edges. We will see that by building this pattern of CNOTs from an expander graph, the gadget can be made fault-tolerant.

First, we define these terms more precisely.

Definition 17. *A fault-tolerant postselection gadget for a Pauli P is a fault-tolerant (Def. 14) subcircuit V with $|P|$ inputs and $|P|$ outputs, such that V is proportional to a projector into the $+1$ eigenspace of P.*

Definition 18. *For an undirected graph $G = (V_G, E_G)$, $v \in V_G$ and $S \subseteq V_G$, define ∂v or ∂S to be the set of edges bordering v or S respectively. Say that (V_G, E_G) has edge expansion ϕ if $|\partial S| \geq \phi |S|$ whenever $|S| \leq |V_G|/2$.*

Here we can identify subsets of V_G, E_G with the vector spaces $\mathbb{F}_2^{V_G}, \mathbb{F}_2^{E_G}$, in which case ∂ is a $\mathbb{F}_2$-linear operator from $\mathbb{F}_2^{V_G}$ to $\mathbb{F}_2^{E_G}$.

Lemma 19.

1. *Given $P \in \mathcal{P}^w$ and a undirected graph (V_G, E_G) with degree d and $|V_G| \geq w$, there exists a postselection gadget for P that has size at most $O(|E_G|)$, and is composed of Clifford gates that act on no more than $d+2$ wires at a time.*

2. *If (V_G, E_G) has edge expansion ≥ 1 then this gadget is fault-tolerant.*

Proof: Our construction uses two blocks of ancilla wires. There is one block with $|V_G|$ wires called the *vertex block* and another block of $|E_G|$ ancillas that will be the *edge block*. The original w qubits being measured we refer to as the *data block*. These are depicted in Fig. 2.

The circuit consists of the following steps, corresponding to the labeled steps in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2. Example configuration for the fault-tolerant postselection gadget, for $w = 3$. The data block consists of input wires which are postselected to a $+1$ eigenstate of $P_1 \otimes P_2 \otimes P_3$. The vertex block is prepared in the $|+\rangle^{\otimes 3}$ state, and the edge block is used for parity checks on that state. Time goes from right to left.

1. The vertex block is initialized to $|+\rangle^{\otimes |V_G|}$. The edge block is initialized to $|0\rangle^{\otimes |E_G|}$.

2. For each $i \in [w]$ perform a controlled-P_i gate from vertex qubit i to data qubit i. At the same time, perform a CNOT from vertex qubit i to each edge qubit in ∂v_i. Thus each of the w vertex qubits is the control for $d + 1$ controlled operations. Since these commute, we can perform their product as a single gate (for each vertex qubit).

3. Postselect the vertex block onto $\langle+|^{\otimes |V_G|}$ and the edge block onto $\langle 0|^{\otimes |E_G|}$.

The total number of wires in each block is w, $|V_G|$, and $|E_G|$ for the data, vertex, and edge blocks respectively, and since each wire has constant length, the total size of the gadget is $O(w) + O(|V_G|) + O(|E_G|) = O(|E_G|)$ as claimed.

We now analyze the gadget in the absence of errors. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be the initial state on the data qubits. Then after step (1) the overall state is

$$|\psi\rangle \otimes |+\rangle^{\otimes |V_G|} \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes |E_G|} = \frac{1}{2^{w/2}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^w} |\psi\rangle \otimes |x\rangle \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes |E_G|}.$$

Next the parallel controlled operators in step (2) map the state to

$$\frac{1}{2^{w/2}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^w} P^x |\psi\rangle \otimes |x\rangle \otimes |\partial x\rangle,$$

where we use the notation P^x to mean $P_1^{x_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_w^{x_w}$. Finally the post-selection on the vertex block leaves the state

$$\frac{1}{2^w} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^w} P^x |\psi\rangle \otimes |\partial x\rangle,$$

and the post-selection on the edge block reduces the sum on x to only those x for which $\partial x = 0$. Since the graph is connected, these correspond only to $x = 0^w$ and $x = 1^w$. Thus the final state is

$$\frac{I+P}{2^w}|\psi\rangle.$$

We conclude that $V = (I+P)/2^w$, thus proving part 1 of the Lemma. It remains only to show that the gadget is fault-tolerant if the graph has edge expansion ≥ 1.

Recall that the gadget V is fault-tolerant if, for any error pattern E, either $V_E = 0$ or there exists E' on the data qubits such that $V_E = VE'$ and $|E'| \leq |E|$. To this end, consider an arbitrary error pattern E for which $V_E \neq 0$. Write the gadget V as $A_f U A_i$ where $A_f = I^{\otimes w} \otimes \langle +|^{|V|} \otimes \langle 0|^{\otimes |W|}$ and $A_i = A_f^\dagger = I^{\otimes w} \otimes |+\rangle^{|V|} \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes |W|}$. Then Lemma 5 implies that there exists E' supported on the input qubits (including ancilla) such that $V_E = A_f U E' A_i$.

Since $V_E \neq 0$, we can assume that E' is restricted to the data block. This is because the component of E' acting on the ancillas either acts trivially on A_i or maps A_i to zero. For convenience we will assume next that $P = X^{\otimes w}$. The analysis is the same for arbitrary Paulis and differs only by a local basis change. Now decompose E' as $E' = \pm E'_Z E'_X$. In fact, since $-I$ is always in the gauge group (and doesn't change the weight), we can ignore this overall sign. Using the fact that the gadget postselects onto the $+1$ eigenspace of the $P = X^{\otimes w}$ operator, we can WLOG replace E' with $X^{\otimes w} E'$. We will use this freedom to assume that $|E'_X| \leq w/2$. In this somewhat abused notation, E', E'_X, E'_Z refer to Pauli operators as well as the sets on which those operators act nontrivially.

Now we fix E' and show that any equivalent error pattern $E = E_X E_Z$ must have $|E| \geq |E'|$. We will show that $|E'_X|$ and $|E'_Z|$ are separately non-decreasing under the action of the gauge group, i.e.

$$|E'_X| \leq |E_X| \qquad \text{and} \qquad |E'_Z| \leq |E_Z|, \tag{23}$$

which is sufficient for our claim. This is because an increment in either $|E'_X|$ or $|E'_Z|$ is at most canceled by the intersection term in the following inclusion-exclusion formula for the total weight,

$$|E'| = |E'_X| + |E'_Z| - |E'_X \cap E'_Z|, \tag{24}$$

so (23) implies that $|E| \geq |E'|$.

As noted above, the support of E'_Z is localized to the input qubits on the data block. For each wire in the data block, applying any gauge generator conserves the number of Z operators on this segment of wire modulo 2. However, applying a given gauge generator might change the weight in the adjacent vertex and edge blocks. But since the initial weight in the vertex and edge blocks was zero, it is impossible to lower the weight beneath $|E'_Z|$ because this operator has at most one Z operator on each data wire.

Now consider E'_X, and let E_X be an arbitrary error pattern that is gauge equivalent to this. Because the gauge group of the vertex block contains a single X each initialization and postselection, we can always reduce the support of E_X to be trivial within the vertex block. Because the edge block gauge group contains XX along the wires, we can also transport the support of E_X that lies within the edge block back to the initializations while conserving the weight along each wire modulo 2. This same modulo 2 argument applies in the data block as well. These transformations can only reduce the weight of E_X so we can WLOG assume that E_X has no support in the vertex block and acts within the edge block only in the first time step. We say that such X-type operators are in "reduced form." We now show that even these reduced operators have weight that is $\geq |E'_X|$.

The only reduced-form X-type gauge generators can be described succinctly in terms of the graph (V_G, E_G). Using a prime to denote an operator on the initial qubit of a wire, we have the

following equivalence

$$X'_i \equiv \prod_{e \in \partial v_i} X'_e \,. \tag{25}$$

The equivalence simply means that the product $X'_i \prod_{e \in \partial v_i} X'_e$ is an element of the gauge group. Here X'_i is on wire i of the data block, and X'_e is on edge e of the edge block, and v_i is the vertex in the graph corresponding to data wire i. In fact, these gauge generators form a subgroup. Therefore, for a subset of vertices $U_G \subseteq V_G$, we have

$$\prod_{i \in U_G} X'_i \equiv \prod_{e \in \partial U_G} X'_e \,. \tag{26}$$

Recall that we can consider $|E'_X| = |U_G| \leq |V_G|/2$ without loss of generality. Then having edge expansion $\phi \geq 1$ implies that the weight of the operators in E'_X cannot decrease.

We conclude that $|E'| \leq |E|$ and the gadget is fault tolerant, completing the proof of the second part of the lemma. □

Theorem 20. *For each $P \in \mathcal{P}^w$, there exist fault-tolerant postselection gadgets composed of Clifford gates that act on at most* 10 *wires at a time, and which have size at most $O(w)$.*

Proof: For each $w' = 7^{6c} - 7^{2c}$ for some integer c, there exists a Ramanujan graph with degree $d = 8$ and w' vertices [47]. The Ramanujan property means that the second largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix is $\leq 2\sqrt{7}$. By Cheeger's inequality [48], this implies that the edge expansion is $\geq \frac{8-2\sqrt{7}}{2} \geq 1.35$. Choose c to be the minimum that satisfies $w' \geq w$. Then $w' \leq 7^6 w \leq O(w)$. Therefore, by Lemma 19, there is a fault-tolerant postselection gadget that acts on at most $d+2 =$ 10 wires at a time, and with size at most $O(w)$. □

We now complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof: For each stabilizer generator of weight w_i, use Theorem 20 to construct a FT postselection gadget for that generator using $O(w_i)$ qubits. Concatenating these we obtain a FT error-detecting circuit for the original stabilizer code, due to Lemma 15. Thus Theorem 16 implies that the localized code inherits the distance of the original stabilizer code. □

Remark (Explicit bounds on constant factors). This construction is explicit enough that we can bound the implicit constants in the big-O notation for the gadgets. First we remark that while the specific expander graph construction used in the proof of Theorem 1 introduces a large constant factor, more efficient expander families are known to exist with varying levels of constructivity. In particular, any randomly chosen regular degree-6 graph has sufficient edge expansion with probability $1 - o_w(1)$ [49].

So, assuming knowledge of a degree-d, size-w' edge expander, for each gadget measuring an operator of weight $w \leq w'$, the final code requires (recalling that we must pad our wires to odd length) at most $3w$ qubits for the data block, $3w'$ qubits for the vertex block, and $3w'd/2$ for the edge block, yielding a total of at most $3w'(d/2 + 2)$ qubits. If we use the degree-8 explicit Ramanujan graphs from the proof of Theorem 1 then we have $d = 8$ and $w' \leq 7^6 w$ for a total qubit cost of $\leq 2117682w$. If we use degree-6 expanders of with w vertices then the total qubit cost is $\leq 15w$, although then the construction is not explicit. Indeed such expander graphs are known only to exist for sufficiently large n (no explicit bound is given in [49]), so technically we should say that the qubit cost is bounded by $\max(C, 16w)$ for some universal constant C.

Each gauge generator acts on at most $(d + 3)$ qubits at a time, and each qubit participates in at most $\lfloor (d+1)/2 \rfloor + 4$ gauge generators, as follows: The wire in the vertex block touches $d + 3$ of the $2(d + 2)$ local generators for the controlled gate. Of these, $d + 1$ come from back-propagation

of Z errors, while the other two come from an X or Z on the control line. Half of the $d+1$ Z-type errors can be chosen to propagate "backwards" across the gadget instead, leaving one side to see $\lceil (d+1)/2 \rceil + 2$ generators and the other side to see $\lfloor (d+1)/2 \rfloor + 2$. We can place the padding identity gate on the side with fewer generators, increasing the total number of gauge generators on that side by two for a total of $\lfloor (d+1)/2 \rfloor + 4$. On the other side we place the initialization or postselection, adding just one more generator and also yielding a total of at most $\lfloor (d+1)/2 \rfloor + 4$.

VI. SPARSE QUANTUM CODES WITH IMPROVED DISTANCE AND RATE

Our Theorem 1 implies that substantially better distance can be achieved with sparse subsystem codes than has previously been achieved. The following argument is based on applying our main theorem to concatenated families of stabilizer codes with good distance. It was suggested to us by Sergey Bravyi and we are grateful to him for sharing it with us.

To apply this argument, we must first have that codes with good distance exist. This is guaranteed by the quantum Gilbert-Varshamov bound, one version of which states that if $\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \binom{n}{j} 3^j \leq 2^{n-k}$ then an $[n, k, d]$ quantum stabilizer code exists [23]. This argument chooses a random stabilizer code, and in general the generators will have high weight.

Theorem 21 (Restatement of Thm. 2)**.** *Quantum error correcting subsystem codes exist with gauge generators of weight $O(1)$ and minimum distance $d = n^{1-\epsilon}$ where $\epsilon = O(1/\sqrt{\log n})$.*

Proof: Begin with a base stabilizer code having parameters $[n_0, 1, d_0]$ where $d_0 = \delta n_0$ for some constant relative distance δ. Call this code C_0. It has $n_0 - 1$ independent stabilizer generators each with weight $\leq n_0$.

Let C_m be the concatenation of C_0 with itself m times. Then C_m is a $[n_0^m, 1, d_0^m]$ code whose stabilizer generators can be classified according to their level in the concatenation hierarchy. There are $\leq n_0^{m+1-j}$ generators at level j, each with weight $\leq n_0^j$, for a total weight of $\leq m n_0^{m+1}$.

Next we apply Theorem 1 to C_m, which produces a subsystem code with $n \leq b m n_0^{m+1}$ physical qubits, one logical qubit, distance $d = d_0^m$, and $O(1)$-weight gauge generators, where b is the implied constant from Theorem 1. We would like a bound of the form $d \geq n^{1-\epsilon}$ for $0 < \epsilon$ as small as possible. Taking the log of this inequality gives

$$\frac{\log n - \log d}{\log n} \leq \frac{\log n + m \log(bm) + m(1+m) \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{m \log n} \leq \epsilon \,. \tag{27}$$

The best upper bound is obtained by choosing $m = O\Big(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log 1/\delta}}\Big)$, and a straightforward calculation yields

$$\epsilon = 2\sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{\log n}} + O\Big(\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}\Big) \,. \tag{28}$$

A slightly improved constant and stronger control of the subleading term can be obtained using homological product codes [43] as the base code for the construction. This lowers the total weight of the concatenated generators slightly to $\leq O(n_0^{m+1/2})$. We can improve our estimate of ϵ to

$$\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{\log n}} + O\Big(\frac{1}{\log n}\Big) \tag{29}$$

by tracing through the previous argument. □

VII. MAKING SPARSE CODES LOCAL

We can use SWAP gates, identity gates, and some rearrangement to embed the circuits from Theorem 1 into D spacetime dimensions so that all gates become spatially local. The codes constructed in this way are not just sparse, but also geometrically local. This results in nearly optimal distances of $\Omega\big(n^{1-1/D-\epsilon}\big)$ [8], as well as spatially local codes that achieve $kd^{2/(D-1)} \geq \Omega(n)$ in $D = 4$ dimensions.

We will lay out our circuits in $D-1$ spatial dimensions and 1 time dimension. The *depth* of a circuit refers to its length in the time dimension, and its *cross section* is the volume of the smallest $D-1$-dimensional spatial bounding box such that the bounding box contains every time slice of the circuit.

The first step will be to establish a way to compactly arrange sparse circuits with lots of mutually commuting subcircuits in D spacetime dimensions. This then makes it possible to show that fault-tolerant measurement gadgets can be embedded compactly, and finally to construct error-detecting circuits that lead to spatially local codes. We begin by extending our notion of sparsity from codes to circuits and subcircuits.

Definition 22. *Let M be a set of mutually commuting subcircuits that act on some set of data wires. M is* k-sparse *for some k if each subcircuit in M acts on at most k data wires, and each data wire is acted on by at most k subcircuits of M.*

Lemma 23. *Suppose there are n data wires and a k-sparse set M of commuting subcircuits that each have depth at most h and cross section $O(1)$ when embedded in $D-1$ spatial dimensions. Then there is a circuit that is local in $D-1$ spatial dimensions that enacts all subcircuits in M, using depth $O\big(h + n^{1/(D-1)}\big)$ and cross section $O(n)$, treating D and k as constants.*

Proof: First we split the commuting subcircuits into $O(k^2)$ layers such that each layer can be enacted in parallel on disjoint data wires. Consider the graph with vertex set M and with an edge between each pair of subcircuits that share some common data wire that they both act on. Since M is sparse, the maximum degree in this graph is $O(k^2)$. A greedy coloring of this graph uses $O(k^2)$ colors, so we simply use each color as a separate layer.

We arrange the data wires arbitrarily in a hypercube lattice of side length $O(n^{1/(D-1)})$ so that the cross section of the circuit is $O(n)$. Before each layer of subcircuits, it will be necessary to permute the data wires to be within reach of the subcircuits that act on them. Such permutation circuits exist, using only nearest-neighbor SWAP gates, with depth at most $O\big(n^{1/(D-1)}\big)$ [50].

Hence the circuit contains k^2 layers, each of which consists of a permutation step with depth $O\big(n^{1/(D-1)}\big)$ and a subcircuit-enacting step with depth h. □

Lemma 24. *A fault-tolerant measurement gadget for weight w can be embedded in $D-1$ spatial dimensions with depth $O\big(w^{1/(D-1)}\big)$ and cross section $O(w)$.*

Proof: Recall that the sparse version of the gadgets consists of a data block, a cat block, and a parity block (Section V and Fig. 2). To achieve locality, all of these blocks, which contain a total of $O(w)$ wires including pre- and postselections, can be arranged arbitrarily in hypercubic lattices of side length $O\big(w^{1/(D-1)}\big)$ and then spatially interlaced so that each data wire is next to a corresponding cat wire and a few parity wires. Overall the cross section is still $O(w)$.

The CNOTs in the initialization of the cat block can be parallelized so that each wire spreads the superposition to their nearest neighbors that are not yet in the superposition. This takes at worst $O\big(w^{1/(D-1)}\big)$ time steps for the superposition to spread from one corner of the hypercube to the opposite corner. The multi-target CNOTs in the gadgets all commute with each other, so Lemma 23 applies, with each gate as a separate subcircuit. This again takes only $O\big(w^{1/(D-1)}\big)$ time steps, so that the overall depth is $O\big(w^{1/(D-1)}\big)$. □

Theorem 25 (Restatement of Thm. 3)**.** *Spatially local subsystem codes exist in $D \geq 2$ dimensions with gauge generators of weight $O(1)$ and minimum distance $d = n^{1-\epsilon-1/D}$ where $\epsilon = O(1/\sqrt{\log n})$.*

Proof: Following the outline of the proof of Theorem 2, we start with a base code C_0 with parameters $[n_0, 1, d_0]$ and concatenate it m times to obtain C_m, a code with parameters $[n_0^m, 1, d_0^m]$. The j^{th} level of concatenation will consist of n_0^{m-j} different "cells" of qubits, each of which supports precisely one copy of the base code at the appropriate level of concatentation. Each cell exposes one virtual qubit to the next level of concatenation, and at the same time is composed of n_0 different virtual qubits from the previous level. We arrange the base code as a $(D-1)$-dimensional cube of side length $O\big(n_0^{1/(D-1)}\big)$. Each cell in the concatenation then uses that same spatial layout, but with each qubit of the base code replaced by a cell from the previous level. Thus the linear length scale increases by a factor of $O\big(n_0^{1/(D-1)}\big)$ at each successive level of concatenation, such that the overall side length is $O\big(n^{1/(D-1)}\big)$ and the overall cross section is $O(n)$. This creates a recursive, self-similar pattern that resembles a Sudoku puzzle layout in the example of $D = 2$ spatial dimensions.

We arrange the stabilizer postselections into m layers through the time dimension, with each layer corresponding to a level of concatenation. Within the j^{th} layer, each of the j^{th}-level cells postselects their stabilizers at the same time; this can be done in parallel since all of the stabilizers are contained within their own cells. There are at most n_0 stabilizers to be measured per cell, each of which have weight at most n_0^j. By Lemma 24, measuring these will use depth $O(n_0^{j/(D-1)})$ while keeping the cross section at $O(n_0^j)$ per cell, or $O(n)$ total.

Summing over all the layers of concatenation, the dominant contribution is from the final mth layer, with a volume of $O\big(n^{1+1/(D-1)}\big)$. We can repeat the argument from Theorem 2, and choosing $m = O(\sqrt{\log n})$ we find the stated scaling claim. □

This same idea can be used to take existing codes that are sparse but not embeddable in low-dimensional spaces without large distortion and turn them into subsystem codes that are still sparse, but spatially local in D dimensions for constant D. The next theorem does exactly this, and with some interesting consequences.

For the class of *local commuting projector codes* in D dimensions, Bravyi, Poulin, and Terhal have proven [9] the following inequality

$$kd^{2/(D-1)} \leq O(n)\,. \tag{30}$$

This class of codes is more general than stabilizer codes, but does not include subsystem codes, so this bound does not apply to our construction. Nonetheless, it is interesting for comparison. The next theorem shows that any analogous bound for subsystem codes cannot improve beyond constant factors, and also that improving the existing bound would require using structure that isn't present in general subsystem codes.

Theorem 26. *For each $D \geq 2$ there exist spatially local sparse subsystem codes with parameters $k \geq \Omega\big(n^{1-1/D}\big)$ and $d \geq \Omega\big(n^{(1-1/D)/2}\big)$. In particular, $kd^{2/(D-1)} \geq \Omega(n)$.*

Proof: We start with the $[n_0, \Omega(n_0), \Omega(\sqrt{n_0})]$ quantum LDPC code due to Tillich and Zémor [36]. This is a sparse stabilizer code, so in its syndrome-detecting circuit the stabilizer-postselection gadgets form a sparse set of mutually commuting subcircuits that are each of bounded size. Hence Lemma 23 applies, and yields a spatially local Clifford circuit with size $O\big(n_0^{1+1/(D-1)}\big)$.

Converting this circuit into a code then gives us the parameters $[n, \Omega\big(n^{1-1/D}\big), \Omega\big(n^{(1-1/D)/2}\big)]$ in a D-dimensional spatially local code. □

VIII. DISCUSSION

The construction presented here leaves numerous open questions.

We have not addressed the important issue of efficient decoders for these codes. It seems likely that the subsystem code can be decoded efficiently if the base code can, but we have not yet checked this in detail and leave this to future work. One potential stumbling block is that the subsystem code requires measuring gauge generators which must be multiplied together to extract syndrome bits. Since the stabilizers for our subsystem codes are in general highly nonlocal and products of many gauge generators, this might lead to difficulties in achieving a fault-tolerant decoder in the realistic case of noisy measurements.

Another open question is whether the distance scaling of Theorems 2 and 3 can be extended to apply also to k to some degree. Improving the fault-tolerant gadgets or using specially designed base codes seem like obvious avenues to try to improve on our codes. Conversely, extending the existing upper bounds by Bravyi [42] to $D > 2$, as well as extending the bound from Bravyi, Poulin, and Terhal [9] to subsystem codes would be also be interesting. If the bound in Eq. (30) extended to subsystem codes, then the scaling in Theorem 26 would be tight; alternatively, it is possible that spatially local subsystem codes can achieve asymptotically better parameters than spatially local stabilizer codes.

It seems plausible that the base codes for our construction could be extended to include subsystem codes. However, it is not known if this would imply any improved code parameters.

It is still an open question whether any distance greater than $O(\sqrt{n \log n})$ can be achieved for stabilizer codes with constant-weight generators. If an upper bound on the distance for such stabilizer codes were known, then it could imply an asymptotic separation between the best distance possible with stabilizer and subsystem codes with constant-weight generators, like the separation for spatially local codes in $D = 2$ dimensions [42].

Another open question is whether the recent methods of Gottesman [3] for using sparse codes in fault-tolerant quantum computing (FTQC) schemes can be modified to work with subsystem codes. If they could, then improving our scaling with k would imply that FTQC is possible against adversarial noise at rate $R = \exp(-c\sqrt{\log n})$. Even if not, subsystem codes have in the past proven useful for FTQC [6] and we are hopeful our codes might assist in further developments of FTQC.

Finally, it is tempting to speculate on the ramifications of these codes for self-correcting quantum memories. The local versions of our codes in 3D have no string-like logical operators. To take advantage of this for self-correction, we need a local Hamiltonian that has the code space as the (at least quasi-) degenerate ground space and a favorable spectrum. The underlying code should also have a threshold against random errors [51]. The obvious choice of Hamiltonian is minus the sum of the gauge generators, but this will not be gapped in general. Indeed, the simplest example of a Clifford circuit – a wire of identity gates – maps directly onto the quantum XY model, which is gapless when the coupling strengths are equal [52], but somewhat encouragingly is otherwise gapped and maps onto Kitaev's proposal for a quantum wire [53]. Other models of subsystem code Hamiltonians exist; some are gapped [17, 20, 22] and some are not [12, 54]. Addressing the lack of a satisfying general theory of gauge Hamiltonians is perhaps a natural first step in trying to understand the power of our construction in the quest for a self-correcting memory.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Sergey Bravyi for suggesting the argument in Theorem 21, Larry Guth for explanations about [41], Jeongwan Haah for explaining the distance bounds for the cubic code, David Poulin for discussions and an anonymous reviewer who found a major mistake in a previous ver-

sion. DB was supported by the NSF under Grants No. 0803478, 0829937, and 0916400 and by the DARPA-MTO QuEST program through a grant from AFOSR. STF was supported by the IARPA MQCO program, by the ARC via EQuS project number CE11001013, by the US Army Research Office grant numbers W911NF-14-1-0098 and W911NF-14-1-0103, and by an ARC Future Fellowship FT130101744. AWH was funded by NSF grants CCF-1111382 and CCF-1452616 and ARO contract W911NF-12-1-0486. JS was supported by the Mary Gates Endowment, Cornell University Fellowship, and David Steurer's NSF CAREER award 1350196.

[1] Barbara M. Terhal, "Quantum error correction for quantum memories," (2014), arXiv:1302.3428.
[2] R. Raussendorf and J. Harrington, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation with high threshold in two dimensions," Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 190504 (2007), arXiv:quant-ph/0610082.
[3] Daniel Gottesman, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation with constant overhead," (2013), arXiv:1310.2984.
[4] D. J. C. MacKay, *Information Theory, Inference, and Learning Algorithms* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).
[5] David Poulin, "Stabilizer formalism for operator quantum error correction," Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 230504 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0508131.
[6] Panos Aliferis and Andrew W. Cross, "Subsystem fault tolerance with the Bacon-Shor code," Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 220502 (2007), quant-ph/0610063.
[7] M. Freedman, D. Meyer, and F. Luo, "$\mathbb{Z}_2$-systolic freedom and quantum codes," in *Math. of Quantum Computation*, edited by Ranee K. Brylinski and Goong Chen (Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2002) pp. 287–320.
[8] Sergey Bravyi and Barbara Terhal, "A no-go theorem for a two-dimensional self-correcting quantum memory based on stabilizer codes," New J. Phys. **11**, 043029 (2009), arXiv:0810.1983.
[9] Sergey Bravyi, David Poulin, and Barbara Terhal, "Tradeoffs for reliable quantum information storage in 2d systems," Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 050503 (2010), arXiv:0909.5200.
[10] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
[11] David W. Kribs, Raymond Laflamme, David Poulin, and Maia Lesosky, "Operator quantum error correction," Quant. Inf. Comp. **6**, 383–399 (2006), quant-ph/0504189.
[12] Dave Bacon, "Operator quantum error-correcting subsystems for self-correcting quantum memories," Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012340 (2006), quant-ph/0506023.
[13] A. Yu. Kitaev, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons," Ann. Phys. **303**, 2–30 (2003), quant-ph/9707021.
[14] Ethan Fetaya, "Bounding the distance of quantum surface codes," J. Math. Phys. **53**, 062202 (2012).
[15] H. Bombin, "Topological subsystem codes," Phys. Rev. A **81**, 032301 (2010), arXiv:0908.4246.
[16] Gregory M. Crosswhite and Dave Bacon, "Automated searching for quantum subsystem codes," Phys. Rev. A **83**, 022307 (2011), arXiv:1009.2203.
[17] Courtney G. Brell, Steven T. Flammia, Stephen D. Bartlett, and Andrew C. Doherty, "Toric codes and quantum doubles from two-body Hamiltonians," New J. Phys. **13**, 053039 (2011), arXiv:1011.1942.
[18] Martin Suchara, Sergey Bravyi, and Barbara Terhal, "Constructions and noise threshold of topological subsystem codes," J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **44**, 155301 (2011), arXiv:1012.0425.
[19] Pradeep Sarvepalli and Kenneth R. Brown, "Topological subsystem codes from graphs and hypergraphs," Phys. Rev. A **86**, 042336 (2012), arXiv:1207.0479.
[20] Sergey Bravyi, Guillaume Duclos-Cianci, David Poulin, and Martin Suchara, "Subsystem surface codes with three-qubit check operators," Quant. Inf. Comp. **13**, 0963–0985 (2013), arXiv:1207.1443.
[21] H. Bombin, "Gauge Color Codes," (2013), arXiv:1311.0879.
[22] Courtney G. Brell, Stephen D. Bartlett, and Andrew C. Doherty, "Perturbative 2-body Parent Hamiltonians for Projected Entangled Pair States," (2014), arXiv:1407.4829.
[23] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor, "Good quantum error-correcting codes exist," Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1098–1105 (1996), arXiv:quant-ph/9512032.

[24] A. R. Calderbank, E. M. Rains, P. W. Shor, and N. J. A. Sloane, "Quantum error correction via codes over $GF(4)$," IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **44**, 1369–1387 (1998), arXiv:quant-ph/9608006.

[25] A. E. Ashikhmin, A. M. Barg, E. Knill, and S. N. Litsyn, "Quantum error detection II: Bounds," IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **46**, 789–800 (2000), arXiv:quant-ph/9906131.

[26] W. Brown and O. Fawzi, "Short random circuits define good quantum error correcting codes," IEEE International Symposium on Inf. Theory , 346–350 (2013), arXiv:1312.7646.

[27] Alexei Ashikhmin, Simon Litsyn, and Michael A. Tsfasman, "Asymptotically good quantum codes," Phys. Rev. A **63**, 032311 (2001), arXiv:quant-ph/0006061.

[28] Hao Chen, "Some good quantum error-correcting codes from algebraic-geometric codes," IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **47**, 2059–2061 (2001), arXiv:quant-ph/0107102.

[29] H. Chen, S. Ling, and C. Xing, "Asymptotically good quantum codes exceeding the Ashikhmin-Litsyn-Tsfasman bound," IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **47**, 2055 (2001).

[30] R. Matsumoto, "Improvement of Ashikhmin-Litsyn-Tsfasman bound for quantum codes," IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **48**, 2122–2124 (2002).

[31] Zhuo Li, Lijuan Xing, and Xinmei Wang, "A family of asymptotically good quantum codes based on code concatenation," IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **55**, 3821 (2009), arXiv:0901.0042.

[32] Jeongwan Haah, "Local stabilizer codes in 3d without string logical operators," (2011), 1101.1962.

[33] Sergey Bravyi and Jeongwan Haah, "Energy landscape of 3d spin hamiltonians with topological order," Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 150504 (2011), 1105.4159.

[34] Sergey Bravyi and Jeongwan Haah, "Quantum self-correction in the 3d cubic code model," Physical review letters **111**, 200501 (2013), 1112.3252.

[35] Jeongwan Haah, (2015), personal communication.

[36] Jean-Pierre Tillich and Gilles Zémor, "Quantum LDPC codes with positive rate and minimum distance proportional to $n^{1/2}$," in *Proceedings of the 2009 IEEE international conference on Symposium on Information Theory - Volume 2*, ISIT'09 (2009) pp. 799–803, arXiv:0903.0566.

[37] Alexey A. Kovalev and Leonid P. Pryadko, "Fault tolerance of quantum low-density parity check codes with sublinear distance scaling," Phys. Rev. A **87**, 020304 (2013), arXiv:1208.2317.

[38] Matthew B. Hastings, "Decoding in hyperbolic spaces: Quantum LDPC codes with linear rate and efficient error correction," Quantum Info. Comput. **14**, 1187–1202 (2014), 1312.2546.

[39] Gilles Zémor, "On Cayley graphs, surface codes, and the limits of homological coding for quantum error correction," in *Coding and Cryptology*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 5557, edited by YeowMeng Chee, Chao Li, San Ling, Huaxiong Wang, and Chaoping Xing (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009) pp. 259–273.

[40] I. H. Kim, *Quantum codes on Hurwitz surfaces*, Master's thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2007).

[41] Larry Guth and Alexander Lubotzky, "Quantum error-correcting codes and 4-dimensional arithmetic hyperbolic manifolds," (2013), arXiv:1310.5555.

[42] Sergey Bravyi, "Subsystem codes with spatially local generators," Phys. Rev. A **83**, 012320 (2011), arXiv:1008.1029.

[43] Sergey Bravyi and Matthew B. Hastings, "Homological product codes," (2013), 1311.0885.

[44] D. A. Spielman, "Linear-time encodable and decodable error-correcting codes," IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **42**, 1723–1731 (1996).

[45] P. W. Shor, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation," in *FOCS* (1996) pp. 56–65, quant-ph/9605011.

[46] David P. DiVincenzo and Peter W. Shor, "Fault-tolerant error correction with efficient quantum codes," Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3260–3263 (1996), quant-ph/9605031.

[47] M. Morgenstern, "Existence and Explicit Constructions of $q+1$ Regular Ramanujan Graphs for Every Prime Power q," Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **62**, 44 – 62 (1994).

[48] S. Hoory, N. Linial, and A. Wigderson, "Expander graphs and their applications," Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **43**, 439–562 (2006).

[49] Béla Bollobás, "The isoperimetric number of random regular graphs," European Journal of Combinatorics **9**, 241–244 (1988).

[50] C. D. Thompson and H. T. Kung, "Sorting on a mesh-connected parallel computer," Commun. ACM **20**, 263–271 (1977).

[51] Fernando Pastawski, Alastair Kay, Norbert Schuch, and Ignacio Cirac, "Limitations of passive protection of quantum information," Quant. Info. Comp. **10**, 0580–0618 (2009), arXiv:0911.3843.

[52] Elliott Lieb, Theodore Schultz, and Daniel Mattis, "Two soluble models of an antiferromagnetic chain," Ann. Phys. **16**, 407–466 (1961).

[53] A Yu Kitaev, "Unpaired majorana fermions in quantum wires," Phys.-Usp. **44**, 131–136 (2001), arXiv:cond-mat/0010440.

[54] Julien Dorier, Federico Becca, and Frédéric Mila, "Quantum compass model on the square lattice," Phys. Rev. B **72**, 024448 (2005), arXiv:cond-mat/0501708.